REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims pending in the instant application are numbered 1-16. Claims 1-12 and 15-16 presently stand rejected. Claims 13 and 14 presently stand objected to. The Applicant respectfully requests that the instant application be reconsidered in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the March 1, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lam et al., US Patent No. 5,856,760 (hereinafter Lam).

With regard to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, MPEP § 2131 sets forth that

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

Independent claim 1 of the instant patent application expressly recites:

> 1. A circuit, comprising:
>
> a first current limiting circuit including a first switch and a first current source coupled between a selector terminal and a first voltage bus, wherein *the selector terminal is coupled to select a mode of operation of an integrated circuit, the first current limiting circuit having a first fixed current limit value and a third fixed current limit value, the first current limiting circuit adapted to limit a current out of the selector terminal to the first fixed current limit value or the third fixed current limit value* in response to a voltage on the selector terminal; and
>
> a second current limiting circuit including a second switch and a second current source coupled between the selector terminal and a second voltage bus, *the second current limiting circuit having a second fixed current limit value and a fourth fixed current limit value, the second current limiting circuit adapted to limit a current into the selector terminal to the second fixed current limit value or the fourth fixed current limit value* in response to the voltage on the selector terminal.

Therefore, the presently claimed invention expressly recites *a selector terminal coupled to select a mode of operation of an integrated circuit* with a *first current limiting circuit having a first fixed current limit value and a third fixed current limit value*. A first current limiting circuit is expressly recited to be adapted to *limit a current out of the selector terminal to the first fixed current limit value or the third fixed current limit value* in response to a voltage on the selector terminal. A second current limiting circuit is expressly recited to have *a second fixed current limit value and a fourth fixed current limit value*. The second current limiting circuit is expressly recited to be adapted to *limit a current into the selector terminal to the second fixed current limit value or the fourth fixed current limit value* in response to the voltage on the selector terminal.

Lam is directed to an overdrive protection clamp scheme for feedback amplifiers. Lam discloses limiting the:

> current through a resistor R_{gm} that interconnects the current inputs of two transconductance amplifiers that make up the input stage of a Class-AB feedback amplifier.

(Lam, column 4, lines 31-35). In column 10, lines 1-3, Lam discloses that the

> maximum current through R_{gm} is set by the values of resistors R_{x1}, R_{x2}, R_{gm} and the current outputs of CS7 and CS8.

Lam fails to disclose, teach or even fairly suggest at least the expressly recited claim limitations of a selector terminal coupled to select a mode of operation of an integrated circuit, a first current limiting circuit having a first fixed current limit value and a third fixed current limit value, where the first current limiting circuit is adapted to limit a current out of the selector terminal to the first fixed current limit value or the third fixed current limit value in response to a voltage on the selector terminal and a second current limiting circuit having a

second fixed current limit value and a fourth fixed current limit value, where the second current limiting circuit is adapted to limit a current into the selector terminal to the second fixed current limit value or the fourth fixed current limit value in response to the voltage on the selector terminal.

Instead, Lam discloses that the current through R_{gm} is limited based on the values of resistors R_{x1}, R_{x2}, R_{gm} and the current outputs of CS7 and CS8. Therefore, Lam fails to disclose teach or fairly suggest expressly recited claim elements.

Claims 2-3 are dependent claims of claim 1 and therefore distinguish by virtue of the dependence. Indeed, claims 2-3 distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Since Lam fails to disclose, teach or fairly suggest the presently claimed invention as expressly recited, the Applicant respectfully request that the instant section 102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the March 1, 2006 Office Action, claims 4-12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam in view of Nishiyama, JP 10-190451 (hereinafter Nishiyama).

With regard to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, MPEP § 2143.03 sets forth that

> To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 1-3 are patentable for at least the reasons stated above. Nishiyama also fails

teach or even fairly suggest at least the expressly recited claim limitations of a selector terminal coupled to select a mode of operation of an integrated circuit with a first current limiting circuit having a first fixed current limit value and a third fixed current limit value, where the first current limiting circuit is adapted to limit a current out of the selector terminal to the first fixed current limit value or the third fixed current limit value in response to a voltage on the selector terminal and a second current limiting circuit having a second fixed current limit value and a fourth fixed current limit value, where the second current limiting circuit adapted to limit a current into the selector terminal to the second fixed current limit value or the fourth fixed current limit value in response to the voltage on the selector terminal.

Therefore, whether taken singularly or in combination, both Lam and/or Nishiyama fails to disclose, teach or suggest the presently claimed invention as expressly recited. The remaining rejected claims 4-12 and 15-16 are dependent claims of claim 1 and therefore distinguish by virtue of the dependence as set forth in the *In re Fine* decision. Indeed, claims 4-12 and 15-16 distinguish for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Since both Lam and/or Nishiyama, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or fairly suggest expressly recited claim limitations, the Applicant respectfully request that the instant section 103 rejections be withdrawn.

If there is a deficiency in fees, please charge our Deposit Acct. No. 02-2666.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6-1-06

James Y. Go
Reg. No. 40,621

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(206) 292-8600

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on June 1, 2006
Date of Deposit

Yuko Tanaka
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Y. Tanaka
Signature

June 1, 2006
Date